

December 15, 1967

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A 6241

cific industrial sectors. These bodies which are composed of governments', employers' and workers' representatives from a wide range of countries were set up to examine at an international level the labor problems which arise in a given industry. Some of them, the Textiles Committee for example, have already considered the social implications of changes in international trade in the industry concerned. But so far they have had little opportunity to engage in a systematic examination of the labor policies that need to be adopted in both developing and developed countries as a basis for an expansion and adjustment of trade in the products of the industries concerned. Nevertheless, this is an important role which they could play, in full collaboration with G.A.T.T. and U.N.C.T.A.D., as and when these latter bodies adopt decisions affecting a particular industry. Or, indeed, their review of the labor problems of trade in a given industry might on occasions precede G.A.T.T. and U.N.C.T.A.D. negotiations, in order that government trade negotiators might be fully aware of the magnitude and nature of the social problems involved and the feelings of workers and employers in the industries concerned.

Finally, I believe that the practical technical co-operation provided by the I.L.O. to the developing countries in such fields as manpower planning, vocational training, management development, co-operative development, wages and social security and so on has greatly contributed to improving their trading position, by assisting in the development of appropriate policies and procedures. Perhaps it is not too far-fetched to suggest that parallel to these efforts, the I.L.O. might be in a position to give assistance to the industrialised countries on their social adjustment problems, when requested to do so. Certainly, the I.L.O. performs a valuable service as a clearing house for information and as a research institution for the study of such matters as the factors affecting labor mobility or redundancy procedures—two studies which were undertaken by the I.L.O. for the Office of Manpower, Automation and Training of the United States Department of Labor.

It is not only at the world-wide level that new trading arrangements are being worked out. There has in recent years been increasing interest in regional economic groupings and in achieving a division of labor among countries within particular geographical regions. Work with this objective in mind has begun in the United Nations regional economic commissions, and in more embryonic form, through such media as the Latin American Free Trade Association (L.A.F.T.A.), the Central American Common Market, and groupings in Africa on the regional and sub-regional level. But the European Economic Community (E.E.C.) is by far the most advanced example of a concerted economic and social effort. The adaptation of employment to shifts in the currents of trade within the Common Market have proved remarkably and unexpectedly smooth and easy. The main reasons for this phenomenon appear to be firstly that a high level of economic activity and employment has prevailed, so that finding new jobs for displaced workers has not been difficult; secondly that measures were formulated for the early transitional period which ensured that changes did not occur faster than the repercussions thereof could be absorbed; and thirdly that the Treaty of Rome provides for a free movement of labor among member countries as well as other measures to facilitate labor mobility, including a fund for retraining and resettling workers.

We must remember, of course, that the member countries of the Common Market are at relatively similar stages of economic and social development—a quite advanced one at that—and that any comparison with

a Latin American, Asian or African context must take into account both the lower levels of the latter two areas and the disparities within each region. But the main lesson of the Common Market experience is that the differences between member countries with regard to labor standards and social policies which prevailed have not constituted insuperable obstacles to rapid progress toward economic integration. What has been found necessary is a *harmonisation* rather than a standardisation of social policies. This is perhaps the main lesson to be learned from the E.E.C. experience, not only with regard to regional economic groupings, but also for trade at the world-wide level. Unless more energetic steps are taken to harmonise or to co-ordinate social policies through an international body such as the I.L.O., I fear that efforts to devise new directions in world trade will never be fully effective.

If I have laid such emphasis on the possibilities of international action in the social field, it is not because I think that this is in any way a substitute for national action to facilitate trade expansion. International action such as I have suggested can only point out possible solutions to certain problems; it can only propose a concerted international approach to these problems. But national authorities, in co-operation with national trade unions and national businessmen, alone are competent to devise the detailed policies and measures which will make new directions in trade possible.

We look to a country such as the United States, with its vast wealth and its enormous resourcefulness and generosity, to give a lead in making these changes in world trade possible. I realize that the implementation of the appropriate policies such as I have outlined would involve outstanding international statesmanship and a large measure of domestic political courage on the part of the developed countries. However, difficulties of implementation should never be regarded as permanent or inalterable factors in public affairs. Such difficulties are, in reality, strictly relative to the priorities accorded to the objectives in question. For example, when the full danger of the political and economic situation of Western Europe after the last World War was understood by the citizens of the United States, this nation adopted and implemented policies of the magnitude of the Marshall Plan with a determination that overcame the unprecedented economic burden and the political adjustments such action posed for the United States. The case for co-operating with the economically underdeveloped world today is quite similar. The problem is that the industrialised countries have yet to show by tangible action their realization that this terrible poverty of two-thirds of the world requires co-operation with regard to trade as well as aid. The problems of structural adjustment raised by a changed pattern of international trade have not been faced with the sympathy reserved for problems which are domestic in origin nor has a comprehensive policy approach to all aspects of structural change been attempted. Such a comprehensive approach could provide the basic principle for a co-ordinated utilisation of the growing arsenal of corrective measures and mechanisms which have been developed and implemented in Europe and in North America and the availability of expertise at the international level.

I cannot believe that the talent assembled in this room and in similar centres of learning and industry across this prosperous and vital nation will not commit their support to an effort that is concerned with mutual benefit as much as benevolence. For the suggestions that I have discussed today can certainly be supplemented by the results of objective research and creative thinking that is independent of, yet that does not ignore, political considerations. I am convinced that the need is great and that we are up to the

challenge. I hope my talk has at least conveyed that basic point; perhaps I have indicated some steps forward as well.

*N.E. De*  
**Nasser's Game Threatens World Peace**

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

**HON. WILLIAM L. SPRINGER**

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 15, 1967

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, as we approach the season of Christmas, it is sad to note that the Egyptian dictator seems bent on precipitating another tragic Israel-Arab conflict in the land where Jesus was born.

President Nasser of the United Arab Republic is playing a dangerous game. When the drubbing he took in last June's lightning war is recalled, it is unbelievable that he would invite another encounter with the Israelis.

Let the Economist of London reports from Jerusalem that "few Israelis now see any way to avoid another war and they expect it sooner than later."

Israel blames Nasser for recent acts of terrorism against Israelis by gangs operating from Jordan. With the Israelis firmly ensconced on the Suez within easy striking distance of Cairo itself, Nasser has no stomach for another desert war on his own territory. King Hussein, a big loser in last June's conflict, wants to keep the terrorists in check, but according to the Economist, the King's efforts are "being eroded by Nasser's new thrust to regain the initiative in Middle East affairs."

"Israel will take only so much," says the Economist, pointing out that peace-making efforts in the United Nations "must come up against the fundamental urge to destroy Israel."

That is the crux of the problem. Nasser is unwilling to recognize Israel's right to exist.

There is going to be trouble in the Middle East as long as Israel's security continues to be threatened by its neighbors.

If the Arab and non-Arab countries were left alone to work out their problems by themselves they doubtlessly would have a better chance to work out a peaceful and lasting solution. They have everything to gain by cooperating with each other instead of fighting.

Unfortunately, there always have been too many outsiders who have found it profitable to meddle in the situation. The Soviet Union, for one, appears to have vested interest in Middle East strife. And lately General de Gaulle has joined Russia on the Arab side. De Gaulle has put out his own warped version of the war last summer, accusing Israel of being the aggressor.

Not content with keeping Britain out of the European common market, stirring up discord in Canada and trying to destroy the American dollar, De Gaulle, by his statements, has helped increase the tensions in the Middle East.

If he accomplishes nothing else, De Gaulle may take away the Soviet Union's

A 6242

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

December 15, 1967

title as champion international trouble-maker.

Nasser may feel that Russian and French support will give him a better chance next time against the tough armed forces of tiny Israel. He is said to have acquired ground-to-ground missiles with a range of 250 kilometers and 1 ton of TNT warheads. It is reasonable to assume, in the light of recent public remarks of one Israeli official, that Israel will be able to retaliate in kind. As more sophisticated weaponry is brought into play, the always dangerous Middle Eastern situation will have an even greater potential for involving the great nuclear powers.

This is why the game Nasser is playing is so hazardous, not only for himself and the Israeli but for the rest of us throughout the world.

Clare E. Hoffman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS  
OF

HON. WM. JENNINGS BRYAN DORN  
OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
Friday, December 15, 1967

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, when I first came to the Congress in January 1947, I was assigned to the Committee on Government Operations. The chairman of that committee was the unforgettable Clare E. Hoffman of Michigan. Mr. Hoffman possessed a keen mind and a dynamic and unique personality.

The membership of the Government Operations Committee at that time was composed of some of the outstanding leaders in the history of the U.S. Congress. Yet, quite often Mr. Hoffman would call for comments on important issues from those of us at the foot of the table. As often as not he would call upon me—the least in seniority—to question witnesses before the committee and then gradually work up to my senior colleagues.

The unusual was a characteristic of Mr. Hoffman, but always he was fair and had the welfare of our country constantly in mind. Under his leadership, and often it was stormy and controversial, our committee wrote the most important piece of defense legislation of this entire era. The Unification Act passed this committee and became law in 1947. All of the great generals and admirals of our Armed Forces appeared before the committee. The law called for a Department of Defense with a Secretary of Defense—a civilian with the necessary power to unite our Armed Forces and establish a defense program.

Serving with Mr. Hoffman as chairman was an invaluable experience, one that I will always cherish and shall certainly never forget. He was a great American

who served during critical and tough times.

Mr. Hoffman encouraged me to speak out and stand alone if necessary. I believe that I am a better Congressman and that this House is a greater body today having known and associated with Clare E. Hoffman.

Mr. Hoffman's first allegiance was to his country, our Constitution, and our great private enterprise system. He often disagreed, and did not hesitate to do so, with the policy of his own party as readily as he did with the Democratic Party.

I attribute some of Mr. Hoffman's love of country and his greatness to the fact that he liked the great out-of-doors. He was a sportsman and lover of nature.

Although Mr. Hoffman lived more than a full life, I was shocked and saddened at his passing. He was a warm personal friend and one to whom I shall always be grateful, as he was a father to me in the 80th Congress.

Mrs. Dorn and my family join in extending my deepest sympathy to his family.

South Vietnam Must Finish Revolution  
Before War Can End

EXTENSION OF REMARKS  
OF

HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE

OF MASSACHUSETTS  
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
Friday, December 15, 1967

Mr. MORSE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I include in the Record an article from the Boston Globe summarizing a speech by George C. Lodge, former Assistant Secretary of Labor and now affiliated with the Harvard Business School. In an address to the Massachusetts Federation of Republican Women, Mr. Lodge stated that the revolution in the South Vietnamese Government that started in 1954 must be completed before any real victory is possible in Vietnam.

Mr. Lodge, who has just returned from Vietnam, pointed out that the popular support of the Central Government must be the mainstay of stability and progress. He stated that this does not now exist in South Vietnam, and indicated that he does not believe that U.S. efforts are directed in any way toward creating this type of national unity, and that the South Vietnamese Government is actually destroying the possibility of unity and support as they seek to bolster their power.

The thought that South Vietnam would still be in chaos even if North Vietnam were out of the picture is indeed an interesting and somewhat disturbing idea and in the light of our current efforts, one which needs the most careful study. I recommend Mr. Lodge's thoughtful analysis for my colleagues' consideration:

UNFINISHED REVOLUTION PREVENTS WINNING  
OF WAR, LODGE CLAIMS  
(By Frank Mahoney)

George C. Lodge charged today that the United States will never win the war in Vietnam until it forces the South Vietnamese government to finish the revolution it started in 1954.

Speaking to some 100 members of the Massachusetts Federation of Republican Women he said there are actually two wars in Vietnam.

The former State Department consultant, who only recently returned from Vietnam, said one war is being fought by the military.

"This war is a conventional one and we are winning it but it will only end when Ho Chi Minh decides he's had enough and goes underground, which he will do. This war is just a screen for the real battle," he said.

The other war is against terrorists and this war we can't cope with because the people themselves are so afraid of the Viet Cong they will not cooperate with us in any way, he said.

"We will not even begin to fight the war against the guerrillas until we force the South Vietnamese to finish their revolution and form a cohesive government and a nation with national pride and everything else that goes to make up a nation," Lodge told the women.

This is the one thing the Viet Cong are trying to prevent because they know that if an independent, democratic nation is founded finally in South Vietnam, their cause is lost, he said.

"The government," Lodge said, "has not even begun to cope with this problem of uniting a fractured, fragmented society of 15 million people into a nation of proud, nationalistic people."

Describing the people, he said they do not know what it is like to be a nation and their own government has aided in keeping them ignorant by destroying the villages in the name of land reforms because they were an obstacle to a central government.

"Our approach has been up to now literally spew material goods in fantastic quantities into South Vietnam only to see most of it end up with the Viet Cong through the black market or through it being given away in fear," he said.

"We have literally built thousands of school houses in Vietnam, stocked them with books and teachers to no avail. It is only now, looking at our ghettos, that the government is beginning to realize a school house, with books and teachers does not mean you are educating the students."

Lodge called for the exploiters, who own the rice mills and control business in Vietnam to "be put to the wall."

He claimed they are the men who are holding up the completion of the revolution and preventing the setting up of a strong economic and political structure.

Lodge said that if Vietnam is an issue in the upcoming campaign, the only topic should be that of forcing the completion of the revolution which will end both wars in that country.

He said that although arguments can be made for de-escalation, more or less bombing, getting out altogether, or even why are we there in the first place, they are not the issues that must be debated.

He said the debate over Vietnam is really a debate about ourselves, the credibility gap, "a debate about our American way of government."

Lodge said that Americans, long pragmatists, now need an ideology—a doctrine—which even religion now fails to provide. The end result is the politician must supply it."

December 15, 1967

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

S 18979

treaty in order to take account of the views of their Alliance partners. While welcoming this example of vitality and effectiveness in the consultation process, we must frankly recognize that significant differences of view remain. These must be resolved on a basis which assures Alliance cohesion while making clear the fundamental importance the Alliance attaches to limiting the danger and risks of a proliferation of nuclear arms.

28. A major point raised by various countries has been their reluctance to undertake treaty obligations of unlimited duration. The United States and some other countries consider a non-proliferation treaty of unlimited duration as highly desirable to assure the stability of the commitments all signatories will be undertaking. This issue requires continued study and consultation.

29. A second major issue in the non-proliferation discussions has been the problem of safeguards. The United States and many other NATO nations believe that a strong safeguards provision is essential to any non-proliferation treaty in order that all parties can have confidence in the obligations being undertaken. The six Euratom nations have in operation an effective safeguards system to assure that fissionable material will not be diverted illegally or clandestinely from peaceful uses to military uses. For other potential signatories to the treaty, the most effective—indeed the only available—multilateral safeguards are those of the International Atomic Energy Agency. One approach to resolving this problem might be for present nuclear weapons states to consider placing their peaceful atomic energy activities under IAEA safeguards. The EURATOM member countries have been unwilling to do this for a variety of reasons. These include the success of their own safeguards system; a reluctance to undergo duplicate inspections; the fact that one EURATOM member country (France) has already indicated that it does not intend to become a party to a non-proliferation treaty; a fear of industrial espionage; and the fact that the Soviet Union is unwilling to accept international inspection of its own peaceful nuclear activities. Progress has been made in resolving intra-allied differences on this sensitive problem, based on the concept of IAEA verification of EURATOM safeguards. The Soviet Union has thus far been unwilling to accept such an arrangement, however. More consideration will be required in NATO.

30. A third major issue arising in the non-proliferation discussions has been the implications of the draft treaty for European unification. The United States has indicated its understanding for this problem. It has recognized that a new situation would exist if the Western European nations were to be unified to the extent that a single authority had responsibility for all foreign and security policies of member states (including France or the United Kingdom, present nuclear weapons states). Some in Western Europe believe this is not enough, however. It would not permit a common European nuclear weapons program at any intermediate stage short of full unification as described above. This is seen as removing a potential major field for the development of European unity.

31. The recent decision of the United States to proceed with the deployment of a "thin" anti-ballistic missile system, oriented against the developing nuclear capabilities of Communist China, has caused misgivings and expressions of disapproval by some NATO governments. The possible ramifications of the United States ABM decision, both with regard to the Non-Proliferation Treaty and the security of other NATO members, requires, also, the fullest exploration and especially, consultations.

32. While the Alliance is now responding to the need for change and modernization in military and strategic questions, a parallel effort is under way on the political side.

Thanks to the initiative of the Belgian Government, member countries are now studying intensively the future political tasks of the Alliance and its procedures for fulfilling them. This is the first major effort of its kind since the Wise Men's exercise of 1956. The work is being carried out by a Special Group at high political level under the chairmanship of the Secretary General. The initial studies have been organized under four headings and draft reports have been completed. East-West relations (general and European security).

Inter-allied relations.  
General defensive policy of the Alliance.  
Developments in regions outside the NATO area.

The timetable envisages completion of the study in time for ministers to act on the conclusions and recommendations at the meeting in December of this year.

33. The participants have a mandate to examine frankly and imaginatively the future of the Alliance. It is to be hoped that the conclusions will indeed be "frank" and "imaginative" based on full examination of issues that unite us; the issues that divide us; and the importance of thorough-going consultation on the major questions affecting the Alliance and its place in the world. This effort merits the full support of both governments and parliaments. It represents another opportunity to breathe new life and meaning into the Treaty as a whole and particularly into Article Two. In connection with the study, NATO should find effective means to create better public understanding and support for its objectives and activities.

34. Lastly, as a closely related matter, governments should act on our proposal for establishing the Atlantic Assembly in a new and official relationship to the North Atlantic Council.

35. As the second decade of our Alliance draws to a close, the question is not whether it should continue to exist. The question is how can it be modernized, strengthened, and adapted to our needs. Partly because of new initiatives, partly because governments have been forced to face up to long-neglected problems, the outlook has improved measurably. But constant attention is required at the highest levels of governmental responsibility if the improvement is to be sustained and to produce the needed long-term results.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I also have the honor to inform the Senate that I was elected Chairman of the Political Committee for the ensuing year. I consider this to be a solemn responsibility, because it will be the last year before the option of withdrawing from the North Atlantic Treaty Organization will be open to France, under article 13 of the treaty.

We all fervently pray that President de Gaulle will keep France in the treaty organization, notwithstanding the fact that France is now cooperating to a far lesser extent than is desirable to the interests of NATO and to the peace of the world. Indeed, I hope that 1968 will mark the beginning of a return of France to her full role in NATO; and I shall certainly devote my efforts as Chairman of the Political Committee to that end.

Mr. President, this is an extremely fine and worthwhile organization, doing important work, and I look forward with great anticipation to my duties as Chairman of the Political Committee.

## MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its

reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 7819) to strengthen and improve programs of assistance for elementary and secondary education by extending authority for allocation of funds to be used for education of Indian children and children in overseas dependents schools of the Department of Defense, by extending and amending the National Teacher Corps program, by providing assistance for comprehensive educational planning, and by improving programs of education for the handicapped; to improve authority for assistance to schools in federally impacted areas and areas suffering a major disaster; and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 13042) to amend the act of June 20, 1906, and the District of Columbia election law to provide for the election of members of the Board of Education of the District of Columbia, asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. McMILLAN, Mr. DOWDY, Mr. FRASER, Mr. MULTER, Mr. SISK, Mr. NELSEN, Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia, Mr. ZWACH, and Mr. STEGER of Arizona were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message further announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 5854. An act for the relief of Mrs. E. Juanita Collinson;

H.R. 7882. An act for the relief of certain individuals employed by the Department of the Navy at certain U.S. naval stations in Florida;

H.R. 10050. An act for the relief of Capt. Russell T. Randall;

H.R. 10985. An act for the relief of Dr. Lorenzo Galatas;

H.R. 11287. An act for the relief of Amir U. Khan;

H.R. 12420. An act for the relief of Nguyen Van Hue;

H.R. 13301. An act to confer U.S. citizenship posthumously upon Pfc. John R. Anell;

H.R. 13373. An act for the relief of Richard C. Mockler; and

H.R. 14367. An act to authorize the disposal of beryl ore from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile.

## ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills:

S. 174. An act for the relief of Dr. Eduardo Gonzalez;

S. 294. An act for the relief of Eloy C. Navarro;

S. 866. An act for the relief of Giuseppe Pacino Biancarosso;

S. 1477. An act to amend section 301 of title III of the act of August 14, 1946, relating to the establishment by the Secretary of Agriculture of a national advisory committee, to provide for annual meetings of such committee;

S. 1722. An act to amend the wheat acreage allotment provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended;

S. 2119. An act for the relief of Dr. Octavio Suarez-Murias;

S18980

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

December 15, 1967

S. 2153. An act for the relief of Dr. Jose Rafael Montalvo y Urrutibeasoa;  
S. 2171. An act to amend the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950, so as to accord with certain decisions of the courts;

S. 2206. An act for the relief of Dr. Jorge Rolando Guerra-Reyes;

S. 2265. An act for the relief of Christopher Nicholas Rushton;

H.R. 664. An act to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to provide that bagpipes and parts thereof shall be admitted free of duty;

H.R. 5575. An act for the relief of Panagiotis Paulus;

H.R. 12505. An act to provide that a District of Columbia public school teacher may retire on a full annuity at age 55 after 30 years of service or at age 60 after 20 years of service, and for other purposes;

H.R. 12961. An act to amend title 37, United States Code, to authorize the nontemporary storage of household effects of members of a missing status;

H.R. 13273. An act to amend the Marine Resources and Engineering Development Act of 1966, as amended, to extend the period of time within which the Commission on Marine Science, Engineering, and Resources is to submit its final report and to provide for a fixed expiration date for the National Council on Marine Resources and Engineering Development;

H.R. 13838. An act to provide that the post office and Federal office building to be constructed in Bronx, N.Y., shall be named the "Charles A. Buckley Post Office and Federal Office Building" in memory of the late Charles A. Buckley, a Member of the U.S. House of Representatives from the State of New York from 1935 through 1964; and

H.R. 13933. An act to amend section 103 of title 23, United States Code, to authorize modifications or revisions in the Interstate System.

## HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles and referred, as indicated:

H.R. 5854. An act for the relief of Mrs. E. Juanita Collinson;

H.R. 7882. An act for the relief of certain individuals employed by the Department of the Navy at certain U.S. naval station in Florida;

H.R. 10050. An act for the relief of Capt. Russell T. Randall;

H.R. 10985. An act for the relief of Dr. Lorenzo Galatas;

H.R. 11287. An act for the relief of Amir U. Khan;

H.R. 12420. An act for the relief of Nguyen Van Hue;

H.R. 13301. An act to confer U.S. citizenship posthumously upon Pfc. John R. Anelli; and

H.R. 13373. An act for the relief of Richard C. Mockler; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 14367. An act to authorize the disposal of beryl ore from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile; to the Committee on Armed Services.

### NE JAVITS STATUS REPORT ON THE GREEK-TURKISH ECONOMIC COOPERATION PROJECT

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I have several times brought to the attention of the Senate the work of the project for Greek-Turkish economic cooperation. I first reported on this matter on June 3, 1965, and I have presented other reports to the Senate on October 20, 1965, and January 19, 1967. In those reports, the nature of the project, the fact that it has been sponsored by a special

committee of the North Atlantic Assembly, of which I have had the honor to be Chairman, and some of its accomplishments have been described.

I believe that important progress has been reported, despite the fact that the ever-present problem of Cyprus and the governmental troubles in Greece, has made relationships between our two important NATO allies in the Eastern Mediterranean extremely difficult. At the present juncture in the history of the Cyprus issue and of relations between Greece and Turkey, it seems to me both striking and of vital importance that I am able to report not only the successful conclusion of the first phase of the Greek-Turkish economic cooperation project, but also the commencement of a new and, I confidently believe, a more important and more far-reaching phase.

As the Members of this body will recall, the project has been sponsored by the Special Committee on Developing NATO Countries of the North Atlantic Assembly—formerly the NATO Parliamentarians Conference—with Messrs. Kasim Gülek of Turkey and Alexander Spanorrigas of Greece acting as my Vice Chairmen, and Mr. Theodore Westertop of the Netherlands acting as rapporteur. At the sessions of the North Atlantic Assembly held in Brussels during the week of November 20, 1967, the Special Committee was able to vote itself out of existence, not because it has been a failure, nor because the task of promoting economic cooperation between Greece and Turkey was completed, but because the first, and if you will, preliminary stage of this task was about to yield to a new phase, and because the work being carried on by the project for Greek-Turkish economic cooperation was to be taken over by a new and permanent instrument of international cooperation, the Eastern Mediterranean Development Institute.

It is with a sense of real accomplishment that I am able to report that the meetings at which these steps were taken were attended by a highly representative group of industrialists and bankers, not only from the United States, Canada, and Western Europe; but also from Greece and Turkey, and that our Greek and Turkish friends were able to arrive at complete understanding on the establishment of a new private institution whose task would be to promote and encourage economic development projects of mutual interest to the two countries.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record a list of those present at the November 20, 1967, meeting of the International Advisory Commission in Brussels.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

#### INTERNATIONAL ADVISORY COMMISSION MEETING NOVEMBER 20, 1967

Present: Mr. Kasim Gülek (Turkey), Vice-Chairman and Acting Chairman; Mr. Charles Arlotti (Greece), Acting Chairman; Mr. T. E. Westertop (Netherlands), Rapporteur.

#### Members:

France: Mr. H. Tafforeau.  
Germany: Mr. Jörg Schill.  
Greece: Mr. Evangelos Devletoglou, Mr. George Gondikas, Mr. Alexander N. Zullas,

Mr. Evangelos Kourakos (Project Consultant for Greece).

Italy: Mr. Carlo Castaldi.

Turkey: Mr. Melih Birsal, Mr. Hüseyin Gülek, Mr. Nuri Sabuncu, Mr. Ahmet Ramazanoglu (Project Consultant for Turkey).

United Kingdom: Mr. Richard Coleman.  
United States: Mr. Stanislaw Ciechanowski, Mr. Robert Collard, Mr. Douglas Denby, Dr. F. T. Haner, Mr. George James, Mr. Rutger Rosenberg, Mr. Arthur Ross.

#### Observers:

BIAC: Mr. Bengt B. Ugglä.  
European Investment Bank: Mr. Karl-Helz Drechsler, Mr. Guy Trancart.

NATO: Mr. André Vincent.

OECD: Mr. Peter C. Kruse.

USOECD: Dr. Edward Fel.

Mr. Seymour J. Rubin, Executive Director of Project.

Mr. Albert Zumbiehl, European Director of Project.

Mr. Peter Cusick, Consultant to Senator Javits.

Mr. Daniel Szabo, Assistant to Senator Javits.

Mr. JAVITS. It is a source of regret to me, as it must be to all friends of democracy, that neither my good friend and Vice Chairman Alexander Spanorrigas, nor other members of the Greek Parliamentary delegation to the North Atlantic Assembly, were present at Brussels. This is not the proper occasion on which to discuss the present political situation in Greece, other than to say that all of us devoutly hope for a speedy return to parliamentary rule in Greece.

Peaceful relations between Greece and Turkey are essential to the development of the economies of these two countries, to the betterment of the welfare of the peoples of these two countries, and, to the security of the eastern flank of the North Atlantic Alliance. It is important to note that the Cyprus communique issued on September 9, 1967, made a special reference to this vital fact. And it is my belief that such peaceful relations will affirmatively assist in the return of Greece to normal parliamentary government.

The project of Greek-Turkish economic cooperation was begun at a time when different governments were in power in Greece and Turkey. In Greece, I first discussed this project with the then Prime Minister, Mr. George Papandreu; in Turkey, I first discussed it with the then Prime Minister, Mr. Ismet Inou. It is of more than passing interest to note that the support of the private element in both countries has been constant, and that in both countries, each succeeding government has strongly endorsed the objectives of a project which is, as this one is, devoted to cooperation on a non-political basis, in the interests of the peoples of both countries.

Mr. President, the period since my last report in January of this year has been extraordinarily troubled in the region of concern to the project of Greek-Turkish economic cooperation. Economic problems have been themselves substantial; but the political developments in Greece of April 1967, and the consequent reevaluation of attitudes and engagements has, without doubt, slowed the forward progress of the project. It is therefore all the more extraordinary that the progress which I wish herein-

after to note has been made and that, even during the course of the recent crisis relating to Cyprus, men of good will were able to get together and plan for the establishment of the Eastern Mediterranean Development Institute.

This accomplishment has, I believe, several important implications.

It vindicates, first of all, the belief which I share with my parliamentary colleagues that more is to be accomplished by working toward specific and mutual objectives that can be attained by theoretical and very largely fruitless discussion of rights and wrongs, or of past injustices and future rectifications. What the success of this project has demonstrated, against the widely held and often evident doubts as to whether any kind of Greek-Turkish cooperation is possible, is that progress can be made, if projects are adequately prepared, if they concern matters of legitimate and mutual interest and if, above all, they rigorously exclude the collateral political considerations which give rise to the doubts I have mentioned.

Second, the project has shown that there is a very real role for private enterprise to act constructively in the amelioration of relations between states and between peoples. I may point out, Mr. President, that the project of which I have had the honor to be Chairman, was sponsored by a group of parliamentarians; but it has been guided by an International Advisory Commission composed entirely of persons from the private sectors in the various countries concerned. Its affairs were directed on a day-by-day basis, by my friend the Honorable Seymour J. Rubin, a Washington lawyer with much previous experience in government and business, and by Monsieur Albert Zumbiehl, a French business executive. My fellow parliamentarians and I participated in the affairs of the International Advisory Commission, but in no way acted as representatives of our governments. At the same time, we were able to have, and did have at all times, the strong endorsement of all relevant governments.

The U.S. Government has, on many occasions, stated its unqualified endorsement of this project to me, through the Secretary of State, through the American Embassies in Greece and Turkey, and otherwise. Moreover, the Department of State has sent telegrams of encouragement to various meetings sponsored by the project, including the last one held in Brussels.

Similarly, and equally importantly, and certainly more strikingly, the highest authorities of Greece and Turkey, consistently over the years during which this project has been in operation, and regardless of the administration which was in office, have endorsed it, both generally and with respect to specifics. Other NATO governments have given their support to the project. Thus, an essentially private effort, sponsored by a parliamentary group, has been able to mobilize all of the forces necessary to bring about tangible and extremely worthwhile accomplishments.

Third, this project is, I believe, notable in having made as a matter of

first priority the creation of a constituency for its reports and recommendations, and for having at all times insured that the mechanisms for carrying out recommendations were given equal attention with the recommendations themselves. From the beginning, it has been our intent not just to accumulate professional research documents which would then be given a respectful reading only to be consigned to dusty desk drawers or wastepaper baskets.

All of us concerned with the project have sought to accomplish a day-by-day participation of the private sectors, not only in the United States, Canada, and Western Europe; but also in Greece and Turkey, in the formation of plans for feasibility studies and surveys and in the work on those studies and surveys. This has not been a process of bringing in outside experts and having them formulate reports. Those directly concerned have actively worked on each project, at all stages, from planning to final recommendations. And we have insisted that each report carry within it proposals for the accomplishment of its recommendations—that it not merely say that something should be done, but explain how it can be done. In this way, the project has been able to enlist a wide range of support. Each report, as it has been brought to a conclusion, has carried with it the involvement of those with a real stake in transforming it from paper into a physical reality.

It is these techniques and methods, Mr. President, which I believe have made it possible to report to you the specific accomplishments which I should like briefly to set out hereinafter:

The meeting of the International Advisory Commission held in Brussels on November 20 and 21, 1967, agreed in principle to form an Eastern Mediterranean Development Institute, to operate within the framework of the Governmental Affairs Institute, a nonprofit organization in Washington, D.C., and established an organizing committee for this purpose. The operating headquarters of the Institute will, for the present, remain in Washington. As time goes on, and as needs indicate, it may well be that operating headquarters will be shifted to a locale closer to Greece and Turkey. For the present, the existence of an office in Paris, furnished to the project through the courtesy of the Mobil Oil Co., provides a sufficient operating base on the Western European Continent.

Such an institute, to be effective, must be adequately funded. The project for Greek-Turkish economic cooperation has been the beneficiary of the wise generosity of the Ford Foundation—which has granted \$262,000 to the Governmental Affairs Institute of Washington for this purpose, and of a number of companies and individuals, mainly American. The new Institute has a pledge of support in the amount of \$50,000 each from private industrialists and bankers in Greece and in Turkey, such amount to be placed at the disposal of the Institute for local currency expenditures. We anticipate that private industry, banking, and commerce in the United States and in Western Europe will contribute at

least an equal share. This will, I am afraid, still leave the Institute considerably short of the minimal amount necessary for it effectively to exploit the opportunities before it; but I am hopeful that foundations and similar institutions which have so large a stake in the objectives of the Institute, will again come to the assistance of these objectives.

Finally, we would hope that, as was the case in connection with the magnificent study which has been done on the development of the Meric/Evros valley, we would be able to have the direct financial assistance of foreign foundations and trusts, when the projects to be financed lie in the fields of their competence and interest.

As I have previously mentioned in my reports to the Senate, the Thyssen and the Volkswagen Foundations of West Germany have thus made \$100,000 available to finance the scientific work of the Meric/Evros project.

A nucleus of a Board of Directors has been established for the Eastern Mediterranean Development Institute; this consists of myself as Chairman, with Mr. Karol Arliotis, governor of the National Mortgage Bank of Greece, and Mr. Kasim Gülek, member of the Turkish Parliament, as Vice Chairmen. We, of course, all act in our private capacities. We expect to join with us in the near future a large and distinguished group of businessmen, broadly representative of all fields of private enterprise, and all genuinely concerned with the peaceful and cooperative economic development of the eastern Mediterranean region.

A program of work for the Institute has been proposed to the International Advisory Commission by Mr. Rubin and M. Zumbiehl. It has been approved. This agenda of specific work items will provide for ongoing activities of an enormously useful nature in such fields as tourism, fisheries, agriculture, and the holding of economic development seminars. Experience, and available time and funds, will broaden these fields of work.

One item on the agenda of the Institute deserves special and somewhat detailed mention. This is the further work to be done looking toward development of the basin of the Meric/Evros River. This is of special importance, Mr. President, both because the river and its basin represent a rich and as yet underdeveloped natural resource for both Greece and Turkey, but also because the river is the boundary between Greece and Turkey in Thrace, and because it rises in the highlands of Bulgaria.

I need not repeat here what I have already said in describing this river development project, and its potential for economic benefit. But it is relevant at least to note again that it was, after 1953, the object of a cooperative effort between Greece and Turkey, that a considerable amount of coordinated work was done in the area of flood control, but that further phases of the work originally contemplated ceased at the time that Cyprus became the difficult issue which it has been now for some years.

It is a major accomplishment of the Greek-Turkish economic cooperation

project that it has been able to bring together a team of German, Greek and Turkish scientists, who have now completed a preliminary study of the river and its possibilities for development, and who have laid those recommendations, unanimously agreed, before the International Advisory Commission.

The Meric/Evros project has undoubted economic importance, which in itself more than justifies the effort expended on it. But, Mr. President, it has far-reaching implications, beyond the economic field. For it demonstrates that, with the catalytic help of the Greek-Turkish economic cooperation project, it is possible to achieve cooperation even during a period of political stress. During the course of the Meric/Evros work, scientists from Greece and Turkey have exchanged visits, compared information, discussed their findings, and, with their German colleagues, worked together as a team.

The governments have made available official records, and have issued visas—or admitted the scientists in some cases without visa. The Governors on the two sides of the river have welcomed the entire group, and given them all possible help. I was able, Mr. President, to visit the area myself, in November of 1966—and to do so with my Turkish and my Greek colleagues. The significance of such a work of cooperation should not be underestimated. It gives great hope, based not on vague generalities but on tangible evidence, for the future.

Moreover, almost 60 percent of the river lies upstream in Bulgaria. The Meric/Evros project creates not only a bond between Greece and Turkey, but it thus almost compels consideration of a nonpolitical and useful discourse with one of the Eastern European countries. I shall have a word to say about this, and other implications of the Meric/Evros project, a little later in this report.

Third, Mr. President, note should be taken of the fact that the project for Greek-Turkish economic cooperation has succeeded dramatically in expanding the contacts between those two countries and their nationals, and in placing their mutual problems and possibilities in the broader context in which confrontation is forgotten and accomplishment is possible. The project has placed the problems and the prospects of cooperation in a broad international context—that of the various international institutions in which both countries participate.

I believe that I need not argue, Mr. President, the high importance of this technique and this result. For too long, the problems of the region have suggested to both the peoples and the Governments of Greece and Turkey that the issues which they confront are bilateral issues—to be solved only by either bilateral discussion or bilateral confrontation. Yet it is the fact that Greece and Turkey are members not only of the worldwide organizations, such as the United Nations, and its affiliated organizations—the Food and Agriculture Organization, the World Health Organization, and so forth—but also of an impressive number of economic and political institutions of a regional or political character.

Chief among these is, of course, NATO, the organization which gave rise to the North Atlantic Assembly out of which the project of Greek-Turkish economic cooperation has arisen. But more than that, Greece and Turkey are both joined with the European Economic Community by agreements of association which hopefully will bring both of them into full membership in the future. They are both members of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development. They each participate in the great international financial institutions, the International Monetary Fund, and the World Bank family of institutions—the Bank itself, the International Development Association, and the International Finance Corporation.

What the project has done has been to stress the affirmative and constructive nature of such associations, and the common interest of a number of countries as well as Greece and Turkey, in arriving at acceptable and useful solutions to the problems of the Greek-Turkish area. The project thus enlisted the willing and—if I may say so—enthusiastic support for its efforts of the authorities of the Common Market—the EEC—of the OECD, of the International Finance Corporation and of the Food and Agriculture Organization.

In point of fact, where it has been possible, the project obtained the assistance of such institutions as FAO to prepare analyses and to review proposals for research projects and to suggest names of persons who might conduct these research projects. On many occasions, these organizations have lent their good offices and their facilities to the project, and the project has held meetings in the headquarters of the FAO and the OECD. The affirmative and numerous ties, of common membership in a community of nations and of common interest in questions which in the end are not merely bilateral, have thus been emphasized, and confrontation has been minimized.

The Commission of the EEC, for example, has taken a deep interest in the agricultural work of the Greek-Turkish economic cooperation project, and has provided much helpful guidance and assistance. The staff of the OECD has made offers of its technical assistance facilities. I could go down the line in outlining several similar instances. But I think that, with one exception to which I now turn, the list would merely underline the point which has already been made—that this project of Greek-Turkish economic cooperation has not sought to operate independently of those institutional arrangements which help to bring Greece and Turkey together within a common framework, but has sought to utilize the impetus toward cohesion and toward solution of problems in a common multilateral framework which these institutions provide.

I would like to say one special word about the role of the U.N. development program under the capable leadership of its director, Mr. Paul Hoffman, and his assistant, M. Paul-Marc Henry. Messrs. Rubin and Zumbihel have had many conversations with Messrs. Hoffman and Henry, and I myself have on several oc-

casions talked with Mr. Hoffman about the project. The U.N. development program has given the project magnificent assistance and encouragement. It has taken a deep interest in all aspects of the project, but perhaps most significantly and concretely, in the Meric/Evros River development project. It has received and commented on the papers relating to the Meric/Evros. The senior water resource development officer of the development program, M. Georges Drouhin, was delegated to attend the October 2 and 3, 1967, meeting in Frankfurt which culminated the first phase of the study of the Meric/Evros conducted under the leadership of Dr. Hans Wilbrandt and his Greek and Turkish associates.

The receptivity to new ideas of the development program, its affirmative willingness to cooperate and to encourage this work, and its evident desire to see the work carried to a successful and useful conclusion, has given to me and to my associates great encouragement. All too often, an established institution, whether governmental or otherwise, takes the position that projects not developed within its own bureaucracy are ipso facto not useful or practical, and sees in any external suggestion something akin to a threat to its jurisdiction.

Mr. Hoffman and his assistants have shown—and continue to show—an entirely different attitude—one of active encouragement toward those who are sincerely attempting, through somewhat different methods, to attain the same objectives as those of the development program. I look forward, Mr. President, to further and intimate association with the development program, particularly in the further phases of work of the Meric/Evros, but also in relation to other aspects of the Greek-Turkish project, as it will be carried forward by the Eastern Mediterranean Development Institute.

I should also mention also, Mr. President, but only in brief résumé, so as not to burden this report unduly, the work which has been done in other fields of economic cooperation.

Much has been done to bring governments and private individuals together in the area of tourism, and it is now widely conceded that the mutual and cooperative development of those tourist areas of the two countries lying roughly within what may be called the Aegean region, promises to each country advantages greater than those possible in separate and uncoordinated development.

In the fields of fisheries and agriculture, further discussions have suggested a number of possibilities, including those of joint consultation on production and marketing of agricultural products, particularly early fruits and vegetables, and in problems of transport.

A meeting looking toward the establishment of common research and training facilities in the important field of fisheries has been scheduled, although the political changes of April 1967 have compelled its postponement. At our recent meetings in Brussels, the suggestion of a study of production of fishmeal con-

centrates, to be used as a protein supplement, was put forward, and this is being actively investigated.

In addition, in what one might call the broader area of the science of economics, it has been agreed that it would be highly useful to hold a series of meetings, in cooperation with the OECD Development Center, which would bring together Greek and Turkish economists with experts from other countries, to consider the broad economic development of the two countries. It has also been suggested that it would be useful to provide a forum for the development bankers of both countries, to discuss problems of common interest and particular ways in which barriers to commerce between the two countries could be eliminated, thus providing broader markets which could support stronger industrial establishments.

This gives an adequate résumé of what I consider to be accomplishments attributable to the Greek-Turkish project to this date. I think that the record will prove that they are not inconsiderable, that they are specific and identifiable, and that they have helped immeasurably to ameliorate a situation in which for 2 years at least this project has seemed to be almost the only instrument of cohesion—instead of division—between Greece and Turkey.

I should like to conclude this report by dwelling for a moment on the future of this project, under the institute, and more importantly, the implications for the future of the work which will be carried on by the institute.

The Meric/Evros project is, again, illustrative. I have already described at some length what has been done on that project and the economic benefits of the work already done, and to be done in the future. What I have not mentioned and what seems to me to be even more important, are the dangers of not establishing now a cooperative and coordinated plan for the development of this river.

You will recall that this is the border in Thrace between Greece and Turkey, and that its area—which at present is relatively sparsely populated—is not intensively cultivated, but nonetheless, inhabited by some millions of people. It is, moreover, an area in which a substantial Turkish minority lives in Greece. It is inevitable that this area will come under more intensive cultivation as the years go by. Such cultivation will require more water for irrigation than is at present being drawn out of the river on either side. The river at present floods in the winter and early spring, and is practically dry in the latter part of the summer. Each side now takes water out of the river at will. Only the minimal nature of present water requirements has prevented a conflict of interests, and a competition for the water of the river. But this condition will not last long.

These facts will lead to an inevitable collision between Greece and Turkey at a date not far distant—unless cooperation is now established, and a method is now agreed of utilizing the water of the river for irrigation throughout the year,

so as to satisfy and reconcile these ever-increasing demands. Either the river will bring the people of the two countries together for their mutual benefit; or it will result in daily clashes over the utilization of the waters of the river in an area in which the two populations face each other, and the two countries exist side by side.

It is incumbent, in my view, upon all of us, and particularly on those of us who have been concerned with damping down the fire of Cyprus, to take those measures which can easily be taken now and which would be so difficult to take once a conflict were to arise.

Mr. President, what I have said about the Meric/Evros is applicable, in perhaps a lesser degree, to other aspects of this project. We, in the United States, know, for example, how difficult the special problems of fisheries may be. And these problems have arisen, I may point out, between extremely friendly countries, with no special problem akin to that of Cyprus—between France and Brazil, between Britain and Ireland, between the United States and Peru. As between Greece and Turkey, the entire economic and geographic situation argues for cooperation now—and for the avoidance of conflict later.

I thus close my report, Mr. President, on a hopeful but urgent note. During a period of great stress, much has been accomplished. The accomplishments have been in specifics—the work which has been done on tourism, on fisheries, on the Meric/Evros; et cetera. The accomplishments have also been institutional—the establishment of an Eastern Mediterranean Development Institute. These accomplishments should be taken not as the culmination of a job which has been done, but as providing encouragement for the much more important tasks which lie ahead. And I stress that to deal with those tasks now in a *sine qua non* of a wise diplomacy, and of our own interests, of the interests of the free world, and most specially of the peoples of Greece and Turkey.

#### REPORT ON MINORITY ACTIVITIES IN THE COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND PUBLIC WELFARE IN 1967

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, during the first session of the 90th Congress, the Republican members of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, of which I am the ranking minority member, made an outstanding record of constructive contributions and effective legislative achievement. In a number of instances, minority members originated the central concepts around which major legislation was built. These contributions of the minority cover every area of activity of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare—labor, education, anti-poverty, health, and veterans' affairs.

##### EDUCATION

ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT  
AMENDMENTS OF 1967 (H.R. 7819—PUBLIC  
LAW 90— )

In addition to numerous minor and technical improvements to the bill, major provisions offered by the minority

which were written into law were the following:

First. Adequate leadtime for funding, thus facilitating planning and efficient use of funds by local education agencies—Senator PROUTY.

Second. Demonstration projects and study for schoolbus safety—Senator JAVITS.

Third. Incentive grants to encourage additional efforts for education by the States—Senator DOMINICK.

Fourth. Establishment of a dropout prevention project designed to make a concerted and concentrated effort to reduce and prevent dropouts—Senator MURPHY.

Fifth. Earmarking 15 percent of title III (supplementary educational centers and services) funds for education of the handicapped—Senator PROUTY.

Sixth. Requiring 10 percent of title V funds to be used to strengthen local education agencies—Senator JAVITS.

Seventh. Repeal of Public Law 874 mandatory group rate provisions to assist heavily impacted school districts—Senator DOMINICK.

Eighth. Increasing authorization to provide for captioned films for the handicapped—Senator PROUTY.

Ninth. Encouraging community involvement in education programs in title III—Senator JAVITS.

Tenth. Clarifying Public Law 874 to include payments to local education agencies for Federal forest areas and other Federal lands in lieu of taxes—Senator DOMINICK.

Eleventh. Inclusion of experts on education of handicapped in title III State advisory councils—Senator PROUTY.

Twelfth. Adding emphasis on bilingual education programs to title III—Senator JAVITS.

Thirteenth. Authorizing in-house research by the Office of Education for education of the handicapped under title VI—Senator PROUTY.

Fourteenth. Expanding the title VII provision for technical assistance to rural areas to include all Federal education programs—Senator JAVITS.

Fifteenth. Inclusion of dropouts and potential dropouts in bilingual education programs—Senator JAVITS.

Sixteenth. Extending priority to overcrowded schools in the granting of title III funds—Senator JAVITS.

Seventeenth. Inclusion of preservice training for ancillary bilingual education personnel, such as counselors—Senator JAVITS.

Eighteenth. Requiring the Commissioner of Education to use title III special projects money to meet problems of national importance—Senator JAVITS.

Nineteenth. Permitting the purchase of special equipment for bilingual education programs—Senator JAVITS.

Twentieth. Phasing in State plans for title III programs—Senator JAVITS.

Twenty-first. Insuring that local education agencies will not have State funds reduced when such agencies receive title III funds—Senator JAVITS.

Twenty-second. Clarification of the provision for compliance with the Civil Rights Act of 1964—Senator JAVITS.

S18984

Twenty-third. Addition of AFDC recipients to bilingual education title—Senator JAVITS.

#### HEALTH

PARTNERSHIP FOR HEALTH AMENDMENTS OF 1967  
 (H.R. 6418—PUBLIC LAW 90-174)

Section 5—"Clinical Laboratories Improvement"—is taken from legislation introduced by Senators JAVITS and MURPHY in the 89th Congress—S. 2184—and in the 90th Congress—S. 894. We are pleased that the administration greatly improved the chances for enactment of this proposal by withdrawing its objections of last year and sponsoring this program as its own this year; the American public has gained.

MENTAL RETARDATION AMENDMENTS OF 1967  
 (H.R. 6430—PUBLIC LAW 90-170)

Section 4—"Grants for Services in Community Mental Retardation Facilities"—is almost identical with S. 2836 introduced in the last Congress on January 26, 1966, by Senators JAVITS and PROUTY; these Senators introduced a parallel proposal this year. We are particularly heartened that the administration this year has seen fit to adopt this pioneer proposal as its own and thus materially improve its chances of enactment into law; it is a needed investment in rehabilitation of the mentally retarded.

#### ANTIPOVERTY

ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY AMENDMENTS OF 1967  
 (S. 2388—PUBLIC LAW 90- )

The minority introduced numerous amendments to this year's bill designed to make successful the war against poverty and to overcome administrative and program deficiencies. Those enacted into law were the following:

First. Establishing a new day-care program as part B of title V—Senators JAVITS and PROUTY.

Second. Requiring improved followup and placement procedures, including an expanded role for the U.S. Employment Service in placement and postenrollment evaluation for Neighborhood Youth Corps enrollees—Senator PROUTY.

Third. Allowing youths with a history of serious delinquent behavior into the Job Corps if approved on a case-by-case professional basis—Senator MURPHY.

Fourth. Authorizing a new program of incentives to private employers to hire and train the hard-core poor—Senator JAVITS.

Fifth. Requiring the Comptroller General to conduct an independent investigation and evaluation of programs and activities carried on under the act, with a report to be submitted to the Congress not later than December 1, 1968—Senator PROUTY.

Sixth. Requiring establishment of pilot programs to encourage maximum private industry involvement in training programs—Senators JAVITS.

Seventh. Authorizing OEO to carry out pilot projects to enroll seriously delinquent youth in the Job Corps, since OEO had indicated it should not and could not attempt to serve this element—Senator MURPHY.

Eighth. Requiring OEO to take steps to assure adequate enrollment in the Job Corps from rural areas—Senator JAVITS.

Ninth. Requiring increases in personal

allowances with increased service so as to encourage enrollees to remain in the Job Corps—Senator PROUTY.

Tenth. Requiring Job Corps camps to offer nonresidential training facilities to Neighborhood Youth Corps enrollees—Senator JAVITS.

Eleventh. Authorizing narcotics and alcoholic addiction control and rehabilitation programs and requiring pilot projects in narcotics control—Senators JAVITS and MURPHY.

Twelfth. Requiring establishment of pilot programs to involve the private sector in community action programs—Senator JAVITS.

Thirteenth. Requiring establishment, through agreements with State educational agencies, of combined vocational schools and skill centers in urban areas—Senator MURPHY.

Fourteenth. Requiring the administration to submit to Congress a national poverty action plan which would include estimated costs and duration of suggested programs—Senator JAVITS.

Fifteenth. Authorizing \$3 million to provide temporary and emergency housing and sanitation facilities for migrant and seasonally employed agricultural workers—Senator MURPHY.

Sixteenth. Expanding and revising the program for small businessmen in poverty areas, including new management assistance, subcontracting, and procurement programs and loan assurances—Senator JAVITS.

Seventeenth. Prohibition of use of program funds for voter registration endeavors—Senator MURPHY.

Eighteenth. Requiring a timely and expeditious appeal to the OEO Director for groups denied delegate agency status—Senator JAVITS.

Nineteenth. Requiring use of control groups in community action program evaluation procedures—Senator JAVITS.

Twentieth. Requiring development of comparative data among various training programs—Senator JAVITS.

Twenty-first. Revising the special impact program to include rural areas having a high outmigration, to delineate certain economic and business development functions and to allow the Economic Development Administration to channel its funds into urban areas designated as special impact areas—Senator JAVITS.

A key minority amendment adopted by the Senate was rejected in conference—a requirement that allowances paid to youth under the Manpower Development and Training Act be equivalent to those paid to enrollees in on-the-job training under the Neighborhood Youth Corps—Senator PROUTY.

The minority members on the conference committee also insisted on more effective bypass provisions to ameliorate the so-called city hall amendment.

#### LABOR

This year the Congress acted on only two labor measures: S. 830, which prohibits age discrimination in employment, and Senate Joint Resolution 81, which ended the 2-day railroad strike during July 1967. The minority members made substantial contribution in both these bills.

AGE DISCRIMINATION IN EMPLOYMENT ACT OF 1967 (S. 830—PUBLIC LAW 90- )

First. This legislation, as finally enacted into law, adopted the provision first advanced in S. 788, sponsored by Senators JAVITS, ALLOTT, KUCHEL, MURPHY, and PROUTY, requiring enforcement through Fair Labor Standards Act proceedings in the courts. Other minority amendments include the following:

Second. Protection of bona fide seniority systems and pensions plans—Senator JAVITS.

Third. Requiring the Secretary of Labor to comply with the Administrative Procedure Act in promulgating regulations under the act—Senators JAVITS and KUCHEL.

Fourth. Substituting a right to double damages for a criminal penalty for willful violation of the act—Senators JAVITS and KUCHEL.

Fifth. Requiring an individual wishing to sue under the act to file a notice of his intent with the Secretary of Labor within 180 days of the date of the alleged discrimination or, in an instance where the claim must first be pursued under State law, within 300 days of the alleged unlawful act or 30 days from the date he receives notice of termination of the State proceedings, whichever is earlier—Senator JAVITS.

SETTLEMENT OF RAILWAY LABOR DISPUTE (S.J. RES. 81—PUBLIC LAW 90-54)

This measure created a special board to mediate between the parties to the railroad labor dispute and, if necessary, make an award resolving the issues. Through the amendment sponsored by Senator JAVITS, the award of the board was required to be within the limits of the collective bargaining which had already taken place, thus preventing the possibility of a "runaway board." Other amendments sponsored by Senator JAVITS empowered the board to clarify its award and channeled all litigation concerning the award through a single court, thus eliminating the possibility of conflicting judicial interpretations of the same award and "forum shopping."

#### VETERANS' AFFAIRS

VETERANS' PENSION AND READJUSTMENT ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1967 (S. 16—PUBLIC LAW 90-77)

Extend past the July 25, 1967, expiration date the home loan guarantee program for veterans of World War II—Senator JAVITS.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana has the floor.

Mr. METCALF. How much time does the Senator desire?

Mr. MILLER. Two minutes.

Mr. METCALF. I am happy to yield to the distinguished Senator from Iowa.

#### WILSON AND LAWRENCE ON THE STATE OF AMERICAN POLITICS

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, in today's Washington Evening Star there is published an article written by the distinguished columnist, Richard Wilson, entitled "No, Mr. President, Insulting GOP Won't Do."

In that article, Mr. Wilson does a most appropriate job of putting in proper per-

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded. The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### NGUYEN VAN BE

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the pending business be temporarily laid aside, and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar Order No. 931, H.R. 10397.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from West Virginia? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The bill will be stated by title.

The ASSISTANT LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 10397) for the relief of Nguyen Van Be (James Be Roellig).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill (H.R. 10397) for the relief of Nguyen Van Be (James Be Roellig) was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. LAUSCHE subsequently said: Mr. President, the special relief bill which we have just passed would bring to the United States a 15-year-old Vietnamese boy.

That boy was adopted by Cincinnatians, the parents of a young man who was in the Navy of the United States in Vietnam. That Navy boy found the Vietnamese lad as a waif and became attached to him. He helped him. The relationship became so close that the Navy boy wrote to his parents in Cincinnati and asked them to adopt this young waif from South Vietnam.

The bill which we passed was necessary because the adopted waif was more than 14 years old, and under the law he did not have the right to enter the United States without special relief being granted.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the following bills of the Senate:

S. 174. An act for the relief of Dr. Eduardo Gonzalez;

S. 866. An act for the relief of Giuseppe Pacino Blancarosso;

S. 1477. An act to amend section 301 of title III of the act of August 14, 1946, relating to the establishment by the Secretary of Agriculture of a national advisory committee, to provide for annual meetings of such committee;

S. 1722. An act to amend the wheat acreage allotment provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended;

S. 2119. An act for the relief of Dr. Octavio Suarez-Murias;

S. 2153. An act for the relief of Dr. Jose Rafael Montalvo y Urrutibeascoa;

S. 2206. An act for the relief of Dr. Jorge Rolando Guerra-Reyes; and

S. 2265. An act for the relief of Christopher Nicholas Rushton.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 1141) to permit duty-free treatment of limestone, when imported to be used in the manufacture of cement, pursuant to the Trade Expansion Act of 1962.

#### NE 266 APPEASEMENT IN THE MIDDLE EAST

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I have in my hand an editorial written by William Randolph Hearst, Jr., which deals with the Middle East situation, in which Mr. Hearst states:

America's relations with Israel, our only real friend in the Middle East, keep getting curiously and curiously.

When the Hearst task force was in Israel a few weeks back we found that country's military and government leaders puzzled, hurt and a bit indignant at the role the U.S. was playing in the continuing Mideast drama.

The writer of the editorial goes on to tell about how Egypt is being aided by Communist Russia, and I assume Poland and Czechoslovakia, to the extent that its military equipment, lost in the recent war, has been almost completely replaced.

There are other aspects of the editorial that are quite significant to me.

Mr. Hearst states:

Not only is Israel the only democracy in that part of the world, the only friend of America, it is one of the few countries anywhere that has shown any appreciation of what America is trying to do in Vietnam.

Mr. President, the editorial rather pointedly and clearly sets forth a number of weaknesses which I think exist with respect to our treatment of the Mideast situation. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

#### IN A WORD, APPEASEMENT

(By William Randolph Hearst, Jr.)

WASHINGTON.—America's relations with Israel, our only real friend in the Middle East, keep getting curiously and curiously.

When the Hearst Task Force was in Israel a few weeks back we found that country's military and government leaders puzzled, hurt and a bit indignant at the role the U.S. was playing in the continuing Mideast drama.

There was the U. S. urging Israel to pull back from new (but in some instances age-old), eminently sensible and defensible borders she had established—and in one instance reestablished—during the lightning-like six days' war in June. And there we were turning a deaf ear to Israel's requests to purchase arms that would only restore

the pre-war ratio and keep her on a parity with Arab neighbors sworn to drive her into the sea.

All of this, mind you, while the Soviet Union was operating an airlift to her Arab stooges that has now replaced all but a fraction of the vast stores of planes, tanks and other equipment lost in the June campaign, and actually increased the Arabs' fire power.

That was the view from Tel Aviv, and I could share the feeling of frustration the Israelis felt.

Now I must tell you the view from Washington isn't a bit clearer, and that U. S. actions still don't make sense.

The after-effects of the six-days' war have been among the oddest in history.

As Israel's Foreign Minister Abba Eban has pointed out, it is the victor in this war who is seeking the peace terms while the vanquished are refusing to come to the negotiating table except on their terms.

The Arabs are being encouraged in their obstinance by both the Russians and President De Gaulle. The motives of both are clearcut and mostly matters of self-interest.

In return for the billions of dollars' worth of equipment they have supplied to the Arabs the Soviets have obtained a long-sought beachhead in the western Mediterranean. Soviet warships can now be seen in Alexandria.

The French—or I should say DeGaulle, because many if not most of his countrymen are not with him in his anti-Israeli stand—is involved in a nice bit of double-dealing. DeGaulle has reneged on a transaction under which he was to deliver 50 Mirage fighter planes to Israel—and this after Israel had already paid \$40 million on a \$60 million contract. At the same time France is selling arms to the Arab countries, including some Mirages to Iraq.

Pure pique is part of the explanation for the French double-cross—DeGaulle is still furious with the Israelis because they proceeded with their war of survival last June despite his strictures against such a move.

Pure greed provides the rest of the explanation. Iraq recently signed an agreement with a French government oil company to exploit large fields confiscated from the British-owned Iraq Petroleum Co.

So the Russian and French motives are at least understandable, if not admirable. But how do you explain the United States' actions?

Not only is Israel the only democracy in that part of the world, the only friend of America, it is one of the few countries anywhere that has shown any appreciation of what America is trying to do in Vietnam.

Like South Vietnam, Israel is menaced by a numerically superior force serving the interests of world Communism.

Beyond that, as Premier Levi Eshkol made clear in a talk we had in Jerusalem, Israel's leaders recognize that both Israel and the United States are defending democracy and freedom in different parts of the world.

Mr. Eshkol also told me that his government was working on ways of showing its sympathy for the U.S. position in Vietnam.

Perhaps it was a coincidence that the next day the Jerusalem Post carried a front-page editorial commenting on the similarities between the situation in the Middle East and that in Vietnam, and urging Israelis to take a fresh look at the Vietnamese war. The editorial declared:

"At the moment both countries (Israel and

S18848

the U.S.) want to end a state of war. Both want direct talks with the other side. Both refuse to enter into negotiations conditioned upon withdrawal with no guarantee that peace will be restored if they do so."

And the Post added:  
 "The present impasse in the Middle East can only make them (Israelis) better aware of the grave responsibility now facing the American President."

The Israeli understanding of the American position in Vietnam has had no echo here of sympathy for the Israeli position.

In her column, Marianne Means reports that the State Department, which has long harbored the delusion that some of its best friends are Arabs, is dragging its feet on the Israeli request for arms aid. (And the State Department dragging its feet can make a snail look like Man O'War.)

"Israeli emissaries here have been pressing high government officials to get the State Department moving," Marianne reports. "They are particularly depressed by the fact that despite an appeal by Foreign Minister Abba Eban during a visit in October the matter has progressed no further than the level of undersecretary. It has not even reached President Johnson's desk with recommendations."

The sort of thing that the United States is doing—to curry favor with the Arabs—is nothing but appeasement.

Appeasement was a shortsighted policy 30 years ago. And it's just as myopic today.

We are—at least we should be—on the side of the little Republic of Israel.

And if we are we should make it plain and act accordingly.

#### ELECTION OF MEMBERS OF THE BOARD OF EDUCATION, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 927, H.R. 13042.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The ASSISTANT LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 13042) to amend the act of June 20, 1906, and the District of Columbia election law to provide for the election of members of the Board of Education of the District of Columbia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from West Virginia?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to the consideration of the bill which had been reported from the Committee on the District of Columbia with an amendment. Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

##### SHORT TITLE

SECTION 1. This Act may be cited as the "District of Columbia Elected Board of Education Act".

##### FINDINGS AND DECLARATION OF PURPOSE

SEC. 2. The Congress hereby finds and declares that the school is a focal point of neighborhood and community activity; that the merit of its schools and educational system is a primary index to the merit of the community; and that the education of their children is a municipal matter of primary and

personal concern to the citizens of a community. It is therefore the purpose of this Act to give the citizens of the Nation's Capital a direct voice in the development and conduct of the public educational system of the District of Columbia; to provide organizational arrangements whereby educational programs may be improved and coordinated with other municipal programs; and to make District schools centers of neighborhood and community life.

##### AMENDMENTS TO DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA BOARD OF EDUCATION LAW

SEC. 3. (a) Section 2 of the Act entitled "An Act to fix and regulate the salaries of teachers, school officers, and other employees of the board of education of the District of Columbia", approved June 20, 1906 (D.C. Code, sec. 31-101), is amended by striking out the first paragraph of subsection (a) and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"SEC. 2. (a) The control of the public schools of the District of Columbia is vested in a Board of Education to consist of eleven elected members, three of whom are to be elected at large, and one to be elected from each of the eight school election wards established under the District of Columbia Election Act. The election of the members of the Board of Education shall be conducted on a nonpartisan basis and in accordance with such Act.

"(b) (1) Except as provided in paragraph (2) of this subsection and section 10(e) of the District of Columbia Election Act, the term of office of a member of the Board of Education shall be four years.

"(2) Of the members of the Board of Education first elected after the date of the enactment of this paragraph, three members elected from wards and two members elected at large shall serve for terms ending January 25, 1971, and the other six members shall serve for terms ending January 22, 1973. The members who shall serve for terms ending January 25, 1971, shall be determined by lots cast before the Board of Elections of the District of Columbia upon a date set and pursuant to regulation issued by the Board of Elections.

"(3) The term of office of a member of the Board of Education elected at a general election shall begin at noon on the fourth Monday in January next following such election. A member may serve more than one term.

"(4) The members may receive compensation at a rate fixed by the District of Columbia Council, which shall not exceed \$2,400 per annum.

"(c) (1) Each member of the Board of Education elected from a ward shall at the time of his nomination (A) be a qualified elector (as that term is defined in section 2 of the District of Columbia Election Act) in the school election ward from which he seeks election, (B) have, for the one-year period immediately preceding his nomination, resided in the school election ward from which he is nominated, (C) have, during the three years next preceding his nomination, been an actual resident of the District of Columbia and have during such period claimed residence nowhere else, and (D) hold no elective office other than delegate or alternate delegate to a convention of a political party nominating candidates for the Presidency and Vice Presidency of the United States. A member shall forfeit his office upon failure to maintain the qualifications required by this paragraph.

"(2) Each member of the Board of Education elected at large shall at the time of his nomination (A) be a qualified elector (as that term is defined in section 2 of the District of Columbia Election Act) in the District of Columbia, (B) have, during the three-year period next preceding his nomination, been an actual resident of the District of Columbia and having during such period claimed residence nowhere else, and (C) hold no elective office other than delegate or alternate delegate to a convention of a political party nominating candidates for the Presidency and Vice Presidency of the United States. A member shall forfeit his office upon failure to maintain the qualifications required by this paragraph.

"(3) No individual may hold the office of member of the Board of Education and also be an officer or employee of the District of Columbia government or of the Board of Education. A member will forfeit his office upon failure to maintain the qualification required by this paragraph.

"(d) Whenever, before the end of his term, a member of the Board of Education dies, resigns, or becomes unable to serve or a member-elect of the Board of Education fails to take office, such vacancy shall be filled as provided in section 10(e) of the District of Columbia Election Act.

"(e) The Board of Education shall select a President from among its members at the first meeting of the Board of Education held on or after the date (prescribed in paragraph (3) of subsection (b) of this section) on which members are to take office after each general election. The Board of Education may appoint a secretary, who shall not be a member of the Board of Education. The Board shall hold stated meetings at least once a month during the school year and such additional meetings as it may from time to time provide for. All meetings of the Board of Education shall be open to the public. At any regular or special meeting, the Board may proceed in executive session, but no final policy decision shall be made by the Board while in executive session."

(b) The second, third, fourth, and fifth paragraphs of such section 2(a) are redesignated as subsections (f), (g), (h), and (i), respectively.

(c) Subsection (b) of such section 2 is repealed.

(d) (1) The provisions of the Act of June 20, 1906, listed in paragraph (2) of this subsection, are amended by striking out the terms "board of education" and "board" each place they appear in such provisions and inserting in lieu thereof "Board of Education" and "Board", respectively.

(2) The provisions of the Act of June 20, 1906, amended by paragraph (1) of this subsection are as follows:

(A) Subsections (f), (g), (h), and (i) of section 2 of such Act (as so redesignated by subsection (b) of this section) (D.C. Code, secs. 31-102, 31-103, 31-104, 31-101).

(B) Section 3 of such Act (D.C. Code, secs. 31-105, 31-108, 31-110, 31-111).

(C) The first paragraph of section 5 of such Act (D.C. Code, sec. 31-112).

(D) Section 12 of such Act (D.C. Code, sec. 31-117).

##### AMENDMENTS TO DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA ELECTION LAW

SEC. 3. The Act entitled "An Act to regulate the election in the District of Columbia of electors of President and Vice President of the United States and of delegates repre-

Illinois: Isabel B. Waddy, Frank G. Blumb, William H. Waddy, Bob Mondlock, Joan Mondlock, William H. Roberson, Vivian O'Malley, Elese I. Reed, Ann Simons, Wm. H. Robinson, Thomas D. Hunt, Winnona Carter, Vivian Sasin, David L. Daniel;  
Kansas: Ruth Casey, Miriam P. Harper, Joyce E. Reed, Harriet Burroughs, Elizabeth Lovgood;  
Maine: Beatrice M. Chapman;  
Maryland: Geraldine Aronin, Linda Millison, Nathan Miller, Bette Stein, George E. McDowell, Marit Thorson, Delores B. Ruffin, Elizabeth A. Riley, Milton Wittman, Walter R. Dean, Jr., Charles Lansberry, Jr., John O. Isaac, Virgil Hampton, Wayne D. Swartz, E. Wheeler, Robert Lansdall, Raleigh C. Hobson, Felton Gogau, Margaret Woodward, Louise Rainer, Barbara U. Mikushi, Gracie E. Goode, Monk S. Harvey, William E. Harvey, Lloyd A. Anderson, Robert H. Cohen, Jennie M. Jenkins, Inge Barron, Edmond D. Jones, Freddie L. Jones;  
Massachusetts: Daniel I. Cronin, Gertrude P. Feder, Ernestine R. Friend;  
Michigan: Michael Mahow;  
Minnesota: Mary Ann Banas, Joe Brewins, Joe Gaertner, Mrs. J. G. Scott, Raymond T. Brien, Richard H. Giberla, John Fjelstul, Eb Lipschultz, Joyce Luoma, Frank J. Wierski, Mrs. F. Wierski, Don Fisher, Eugene Powell, Gordon W. Burpe, Verne Follepar, Mays Newhouse;  
Missouri: Martha Hughes, Judith L. Dubbs, Robert W. Chester, Ralph E. Pumphrey, Robert Lawyer;  
Nebraska: C. A. Paterson;  
Nevada: Markin S. Sonju, Mark Brand;  
New Hampshire: Kathleen Neerle, Barbara Hanus, Elmer C. Rudey;  
New Jersey: Arleen Kenney, Wilbur F. Pick, M. L. Cornese, Rose C. Thomas, Wynetta Bryant, Connie Brady;  
New Mexico: John G. Jasper;  
New York City: Elizabeth Wickenden, Gwendolyn Nurse, Myrtle M. Joseph, Elizabeth Twilley, Virginia P. Hyde, Minerva Critchlow, Madyln Screiber, W. Budd Dorpet, Gusta Stuger, Judith Mendell, Martin Silberstein, Jane Saltzman, Totaro Okada, V. Demby, Elizabeth Bayroad, Josephine Ryan, Edith S. Baxter;  
New York: Katherine M. Ahearn, Janette S. Force, Ruby Lowmer, Florence Gitten, Catherine M. Manning, Huidah Marsh, Mary Millicent Hopkins, Myrtle B. Horrington, Natalie Willey Brown, Lucy K. Longhart, Marguerite Freval, Frieda Luck, Elton H. Golden, Louise Nelson;  
North Carolina: Annie May Pemberton, Myra F. Milchman, Frances B. Long, Augusta M. Cooper, Rebecca Peebles, Virginia Pfohl, Margaret M. Stirk, Mrs. Thelma Doby, Katherine Barrier, Patricia Hill, Josie M. Pittman;  
North Dakota: Barbara Stein, Mrs. W. R. Howell, Henry Stimsodt, Miss Nora Johnson, Estelle I. Krick;  
Ohio: Elizabeth Tuttle, Esabelle A. Hadley, Hilda K. Gilbert, Arnett Wright, Judy Fanning, Marian Ramsay, Bob Moor;  
Pennsylvania: Thomas Gallagher, Samuel C. Freson, Joseph I. Nicholson, Helen Abbatco, Jean E. Moore, Shirley D. LeBlanc, Elizabeth Welton, Patricia Tomlinson, Deane Crongard;  
Rhode Island: Amity E. Rein, John J. Affler, Phimer Gottschalk;  
South Dakota: Carol E. Anderson;  
Utah: Melvin Pobanz, Olga E. Ballif;  
Virginia: Richard E. Morrison, Ann Emmon, Betty J. Wright, Bernice Am-spohn, Clara M. Stirk, Pauline A. Rogers;

West Virginia: Gene Ann Snyder, Ann B. Sullivan, Dorothy Allen, Elizabeth Sharkey;  
Wisconsin: John S. Patten, Esther Frolat, W. E. Kurtz, Max Wald, Helen de Bardeleben, Helen MacDonald;  
District of Columbia: Elizabeth Long, B. A. McIntos, Marjorie M. Farley, Linda D. Lovell, Harriet Gruger, Beatrice L. Garrett, Edna H. Hughes, George Sitgraves, Myrtle Wolf, Inabel B. Lindsay, Alan Ane Tausend, Victoria C. Sims, Richard Ackerman, Anna W. Schneider;  
Virgin Islands: Helen C. Owens, Joycelyn Excarracion;  
Unidentified by State: Zigmund Gabruk, Irene H. Jacobson, Judith A. Evelancy, Patricia Milligan, Lisa Gooden, Katherine Sullivan, John Barnett, W. Howard, D. A. Thomas, Howard Kaplan, Grace Hechlenard, Mary A. Craig, Margaret D. Ward, Eugene Leyellotto, Mary Chance, Audry Pittman, I. S. Longuh, Isabelle Axenfeld, Ruth C. Argento, Alicetine K. Bell.

DEAR MR. MONDALE: Our choice for the Senate.

A funny thing happened to the new Social Security bill from the Senate to the House. This bill was not even recognizable after the mutilizing the House gave it.

I am sure I am speaking for all the Senior Citizens in your home State when I ask you for help on this very important bill to us.

C. J. OBERT.

MINNEAPOLIS, MINN.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 14397) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. MAHON, Mr. KIRWAN, Mr. WHITTEN, Mr. EVINS of Tennessee, Mr. NATCHER, Mr. FLOOD, Mr. BOW, Mr. LAIRD, Mr. MINSHALL, and Mr. LANGEN were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

#### ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (H.R. 10595) to prohibit certain banks and savings and loan associations from fostering or participating in gambling activities, and it was signed by the Acting President pro tempore.

#### NE THE UNITED STATES SHOULD BREAK DIPLOMATIC RELATIONS WITH FASCIST GREEK USURPERS

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, the dread portent of the hour is not apparent at the moment. These are black days for Greece. The recent flight of King Constantine of Greece from Athens to Rome has at last clarified the moral and constitutional situation in Greece. It is now crystal clear to the world that General Patakos and his fellow conspirators in the junta which overthrew the constitutionally elected Greek Government are in rebellion against the Crown. Their regime is patently illegal and should be

treated as such by the United States and Greece's other NATO allies.

So long as the King gave his reluctant sanction to the Fascist junta after last April's coup they had some vague claim to legitimacy. Now, it is obvious that they are usurpers. In his effort to overthrow the junta the King has in effect dismissed the comic opera government of the Fascist colonels and generals.

I strongly urge that President Johnson and Secretary of State Rusk immediately recall our Ambassador to Athens, withdraw recognition from the ruling junta and immediately stop all economic and military assistance to their criminal regime. Furthermore, it must be stated in the strongest terms possible to the tyrants now ruling Greece that they will face most dire consequences if they should proceed to engage in a bloodbath and savage repression of the more than 3,000 political prisoners now incarcerated in their concentration camps.

Mr. President, if some ragtag group, including some Communists, had taken over Athens in the darkness of night, surely Secretary of State Dean Rusk and the Department of Defense would have sent in some of our planes and airborne troops to protect American lives, as they stated they had done at the time of the Dominican Republic crisis. And yet, what difference is there in the way the tyrants, whether Fascists or Communists, rule? The Facists now govern Greece by decree. They arbitrarily arrest some citizens, deny them their rights, confiscate their money and property, and without written charges, or any charges whatsoever, throw them in jail or send them to detention centers in islands around Greece. The tactics of that Fascist regime are no different than they would have been had the Communists taken over.

The Fascist clique now ruling Greece has suppressed personal freedom, established control over press and radio, abrogated the constitution and canceled free elections. To date we have accepted these actions. There have been no expressions of profound concern from the administration, no special ambassadors dispatched to Athens, no threat of intervention in behalf of the Greek people to choose their own form of government, no exertion of pressure through economic or military aid to restore constitutional government in Greece. If instead of rightwing generals, a ragtag group of leftwing extremists and Communists had staged a coup d'etat and established a Communist government or quasi-Communist government in Greece, without doubt officials of our State Department and our Defense Department would have immediately taken measures to oust them. The Fascists deserve no less.

It is clear to all that those colonels and generals have no intention of restoring constitutional government to Greece. Greece, the cradle of democracy, has gone Fascist. Patakos is a Greek Mussolini. It is also clear that these ruthless power seekers are now free of the few restraints they had accepted prior to the King's exile.

To continue to recognize this criminal regime would be a blight on our honor.

It is my understanding that the Government of Great Britain earlier today refused to recognize the junta and was reconsidering the entire scope of relations between London and Athens. Certainly, Mr. President, our Government should do no less. In fact, we should take leadership in making every effort possible to restore freedom to Greece.

#### MODIFICATIONS AND REVISIONS IN THE INTERSTATE HIGHWAY SYSTEM

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 913, H.R. 13933.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PROXMIER in the chair). The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 13933) to amend title 23, United States Code, to authorize modifications or revisions in the Interstate System.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from West Virginia?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Public Works, with an amendment, on page 3, after line 12, insert a new section, as follows:

SEC. 2. Section 129 of title 23, United States Code, is amended by adding a new subsection (f) at the end thereof:

"(f) Whenever the Secretary, upon the request of any State, finds that any toll road, bridge, or tunnel which heretofore has been designated as a part of the Interstate System is no longer capable of meeting the standards adopted for the improvement of projects located on the Interstate System without substantial construction, reconstruction, or improvement, which inability to meet such standards are, in part, due to changes in the standards required by law and when the Secretary also finds that such toll road, bridge, or tunnel constitutes a high accident location which cannot be corrected without substantial construction, reconstruction, or improvement, he may permit Federal participation in the acquisition of such toll facility as improved right-of-way, on the condition that tolls will be removed at the time the facility is acquired. In no event shall the Federal share of the cost of acquisition of such facility exceed 90 per centum of the average market price of the outstanding bonds for the year immediately preceding the State's request that such acquisition be undertaken."

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I ask to strike section 2 of the bill, beginning on line 13, page 3. This language will not be needed, since the problem to which it is directed can be handled by other means.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the committee amendment. [Putting the question.]

The committee amendment was rejected.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, the interstate highway program has been in progress for more than 11 years. The system was originally authorized in 1944 and laid out in 1947. It has become apparent that certain projects cannot be undertaken within the completion schedule established in 1956. These projects are all in urban areas where difficult cor-

ridor location problems make decisions almost impossible.

At the same time, within the same States, there are alternate nonurban corridors which could be included on the system but because of the 41,000-mile limitation contained in the Federal Highway Act of 1956, these projects cannot be undertaken. H.R. 13933 will permit substitutions of projects upon the meeting of certain well defined conditions.

In general the bill amends section 103 of title 23, United States Code, to authorize an additional 200 miles. Let me emphasize that this is not a 200-mile extension of the Interstate System. The Committee on Public Works is well aware of the fact that there is a need for extending the mileage of the Interstate System. There are currently pending before the committee eight bills to achieve such a result. The committee will undertake consideration of legislation to accomplish an extension of the system during the next session of the 90th Congress.

The 200 miles which this bill authorizes may only be used to facilitate modifications or revisions in the interstate road program. Two hundred miles are needed because there are only 25 miles presently undesignated remaining out of the original 41,000.

In order for a State to take advantage of the provisions of H.R. 13933, it must be prepared, first, to deactivate a portion of the currently authorized system within the State which is not essential to the completion of a unified and connected Interstate System; second, give assurances that the deactivated portion will not be constructed as a toll facility; and third, be able to construct the substitution at or below the amount of money the deactivated project would have cost under the 1965 cost estimate.

The legislation will provide States with the flexibility to better serve the needs of traffic and at the same time will not increase the cost of the system. In order to qualify, a State must be prepared to give up something. This bill does not provide for an outright increase but merely grants permission to make a substitution and provides the additional miles necessary to make the substitution meaningful.

Mr. President, I want the record to reflect that this legislation which came over to us from the House was considered by the Public Works Committee of the Senate and there was unanimous agreement within the committee that the measure should be passed in the Senate, as it has previously been passed in the House.

Now, Mr. President, I am glad to yield to my distinguished friend from Iowa who has an interest in this legislation.

Mr. MILLER. I appreciate my colleague's yielding to me for a question or so.

I think that he has very definitely stated some of the conditions for the additional mileage that would be authorized. I wonder whether he would mind repeating why it is necessary to have the additional 200 miles authorized for the Interstate System?

As I understand it, the State must surrender some portion of an interstate

segment in order to obtain the money that would otherwise have been spent on that segment for other uses in the State; but I do not understand, yet, why there is the 200 additional miles authorized by the pending bill for that purpose.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Perhaps the best way I can answer the question is by example:

In New Jersey, they propose to deactivate an 8-mile segment in that State. The estimated cost of that project is approximately \$100 million.

Under this legislation, that deactivated 8 miles would be replaced by 40 miles, but the 40 miles would be constructed for a total sum of approximately \$60 million rather than the original cost estimate of \$100 million.

Senators WILLIAMS and CASE, both of New Jersey, expressed agreement on the plan to deactivate a road and construct the new segment to be fitted into the Interstate System. New Jersey is a very specific case to which we can point as to the reason for the extra mileage. The substitute project requires extra mileage to make a complete connection. The 8 miles alone would not be sufficient to serve the needs of the area involved.

Mr. MILLER. So that the extra or new 40 miles will become a part of the Interstate System in New Jersey, and it will actually cost less than the original short segment.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Yes; \$40 million less.

Mr. MILLER. In order to give flexibility, there must be extra mileage, which is going to be there, but without the extra cost?

Mr. RANDOLPH. The Senator from Iowa explains the matter very clearly.

Mr. MILLER. There is no possibility of a State obtaining this extra 200 miles unless it surrenders a segment. So it is a quid pro quo. As the Senator from West Virginia points out, in the case of New Jersey there is actually a saving.

Mr. RANDOLPH. There would be. I mention that because the legislation originated, in part, with the problem in New Jersey. There is also a situation in California which can be handled by H.R. 13933.

Perhaps the RECORD should indicate that we are not certain how many States will come under this bill, but we think there are a number which could use it to solve problems.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, may I ask a further question of the Senator from West Virginia?

Mr. RANDOLPH. Yes.

Mr. MILLER. What is going to happen to the saving in the case of New Jersey? Would it be available for use in the Interstate System? We all know, as a matter of fact, that the Interstate System has, over the years, increased in cost above the cost estimates. Would it be the Senator's thought that this money would revert to the Interstate System fund?

Mr. RANDOLPH. Yes.

Mr. MILLER. For use in another State?

Mr. RANDOLPH. Yes.

Mr. MILLER. In implementing that Interstate System?

Mr. RANDOLPH. Yes.